

TO: Peter Rolla, chair
ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

FROM: MLA BCC Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee (Tracey Snyder)
OLAC RDA Revisions Task Force (Kelley McGrath)

SUBJECT: Discussion paper on the inconsistency between the Statement of Responsibility element in Chapter 2 and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter and Artistic and/or Technical Credit elements in Chapter 7

Background

At the November 2011 JSC meeting, ALA was asked to investigate the inconsistency between the Statement of Responsibility (SOR) element in Chapter 2 and the Performer, Narrator, Presenter (Performer) and Artistic and/or Technical Credit (Credit) elements in Chapter 7. At the January 2012 CC:DA meeting, this task was delegated to Tracey Snyder (MLA) and Kelley McGrath (OLAC), as their respective cataloging communities are heavy users of the elements in question. After much discussion with our colleagues, we have come to no firm conclusions. In this discussion paper, we provide some background on the issue and identify some possible strategies for moving forward.

Current situation in RDA

RDA currently divides information about entities other than publishers that are responsible for resources between the SOR element and the Performer and Credit elements. This practice seems to have been carried over from AACR2 without much analysis. In fact, the original wording for the Credit element at RDA 7.24 was almost identical to AACR2 7.7B6 except for some stylistic modifications to make it fit in RDA and an explicit limitation to motion pictures and video recordings. The instruction was subsequently modified to make it applicable to all types of resources. The instructions for the Performer element are very similar to the instructions in chapters 6 and 7 of AACR2, as well.

In RDA, the SOR is mapped to the manifestation and is a transcribed element. The Performer and Credit elements are in the expression attributes section of chapter 7 and are not transcribed. They seem to have been associated with the expression because RDA has mapped the majority of roles traditionally recorded in the equivalent AACR2 fields to the expression.

Reasons for separating information about different types of responsibility

We do not know the historical origin of the separate note fields for performers and credits in AACR2, but it is possible to make educated guesses about some of the likely causes.

- ***Display of lengthy SORs***

Many moving image and audio recording resources are created with the participation of a large number of people. If all of these names and functions are recorded in the SOR in an ISBD display, it can become very long. This results in an SOR that is difficult to parse and is unlikely to be helpful to users. By separating out some of these functions, the record becomes more readable and the more significant non-performer roles appear more prominently in the display regardless of the order in which they may have appeared on the source of information.

Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone [videorecording] / Warner Bros. Pictures presents a Heyday Films/1492 Pictures/Duncan Henderson production ; a Chris Columbus film ; screenplay by Steve Kloves ; produced by David Heyman ; directed by Chris Columbus ; [cast], Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, Emma Watson, John Cleese, Robbie Coltrane, Warwick Davis, Richard Griffiths, Richard Harris, Ian Hart, John Hurt, Alan Rickman, Fiona Shaw, Maggie Smith, Julie Walters ; director of photography, John Seale ; editor, Richard Francis-Bruce ; music, John Williams ; production designer, Stuart Craig.

– vs. –

Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone [videorecording] / Warner Bros. Pictures presents a Heyday Films/1492 Pictures/Duncan Henderson production ; a Chris Columbus film ; screenplay by Steve Kloves ; produced by David Heyman ; directed by Chris Columbus.

Cast: Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, Emma Watson, John Cleese, Robbie Coltrane, Warwick Davis, Richard Griffiths, Richard Harris, Ian Hart, John Hurt, Alan Rickman, Fiona Shaw, Maggie Smith, Julie Walters.

Credits: Director of photography, John Seale ; editor, Richard Francis-Bruce ; music, John Williams ; production designer, Stuart Craig.

- ***Formal transcription***

For moving images, it can be time-consuming to transcribe from the title frames and having some of the credits in a note reduces the amount of transcription that has to be done from the chief source, traditionally the title frames. Some catalogers prefer to record additional credits from the container.

Both of these reasons for using notes fields are practical rather than principled, which has become problematic in the context of RDA. The Performer and Credit elements do not map cleanly to RDA's FRBR-based model. They also make less sense as generalized rules than they did in the context of format-specific rules. In particular, it is hard to draw a line between an entity responsible for the creation of, or contributing to the realization of, the intellectual or artistic content of a resource and an entity that merely has contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a resource.

AACR2 practice

AACR2 does not seem to provide a principle-based reason to treat entities in the Performer or Credit categories differently from those that are put in the SOR. AACR2 delineated the difference as follows:

For sound recordings:

SOR: major role in creating the intellectual content (writers of spoken words, composers of performed music, collectors of field material, producers having artistic and/or intellectual responsibility); those whose participation goes beyond performance, execution or interpretation of a work

Note: Those whose participation is confined to performance, execution or interpretation (commonly the case with “serious” or classical music and recorded speech)

For moving images:

SOR: major role in creating a film (producer, director, animator)

Note:

Cast: featured players, performers, narrators, presenters

Credits: those who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production who are not named in the SOR

For moving images, the line was drawn inconsistently in practice under AACR2. This can even be seen in the following examples in chapter 7, which at times place the same role in both the SOR and the credit note.

SOR: produced, directed, and **edited** by N.C. Collins
editor, I. Dryer

Note: **editor**, Reginald Beck

SOR: **producer and writer**, James Benjamin
writer, Phyllis Harvey

Note: **Screenplay**, Harold Pinter
Script, John Taylor

The sound recording distinctions were somewhat clearer, but also somewhat arbitrary, and still relied on judgment in many cases.

Because the Performer and Credit elements do not map to a single FRBR group 1 entity, it is not easy to see where to fit them into RDA. Although in practice they are usually quasi-transcribed, they are not transcribed elements so it’s hard to justify making them an attribute of the manifestation as the SOR is. Most of the roles that have traditionally been recorded in these notes are mapped by RDA to the expression. However, the Credit element, in particular, has in the past been used both for roles that RDA relates to the work and roles that it relates to the expression.

Options

We were unable to agree on a clear path forward. We discuss below four options for reconciling the Performer and Credit elements with the structure of RDA that resulted from the discussions of MLA and OLAC members.

1. Make a principled distinction

One way out of this impasse would be to find a principled way to distinguish among roles that belong in the SOR and those that belong in Performer or Credit notes. We have not yet identified such a definition, but it may be possible to construct one and we are open to suggestions. The RDA instructions for Performer and Credit are in the part of chapter 7 labeled “attributes of the expression.” One possible approach that would provide consistent results would be to put only the entities related to the work in the SOR and put the entities related to the expression in one of the note fields. This could be workable for moving images where the main change from current common U.S. practice would be the addition of the director of photography to the SOR. It is less clearly workable for audio recordings of pop, rock and jazz music; the performer SOR is typically very prominent on the source of information, and is certainly crucial for identification, but, whereas the performer was placed in a 1XX in AACR2, performers cannot be considered creators at the work level in RDA unless they have also composed all the music, which is often not the case. Thus, the same recording artist might be considered a creator on one album and a contributor on another, if it includes cover tunes. This change would also negatively impact other types of cataloging where expression-level credits such as editors and translators for print materials have traditionally been transcribed in the SOR.

2. Make no distinctions

We could eliminate the Performer and Credit elements and put all the responsible entities that we think are important to include in the record in the SOR. This is principled and RDA, as has been pointed out, says nothing about display. However, most of us live within the confines of the MARC format and an ISBD display where for some materials, such as feature films, putting all the credits in 245\$c is unwieldy and unhelpful for users. It also increases the burden on catalogers for transcribing multiple SORs if they want to include all the names that they think users will be interested in. This can be time-consuming, particularly for moving image materials.

3. Make SOR a non-core element

Transcribed SORs are modeled on the simple, 19th-century European standard book title page, which is, after all, the palimpsest upon which the whole notion of a structured presentation of Title / Statement of Responsibility was originally imposed. This model is not as well-suited to resources that use other conventions to convey information about responsibility, such as audio recordings, moving images or electronic resources. Perhaps it would be more effective to make the SOR non-core, at least for some types of

resources, and support other ways of recording information about the responsible entities. However, the SOR is included in both FRBR and ISBD.

One possible alternative would be to just use access points or identifiers and rely on the cross-references in authority records to make any necessary connections. This may not work well when functions or roles don't map cleanly to existing relationship designators. Some roles may even be hard to make into concise, ad hoc relationship designators. It is also a greater burden on catalogers to create access points for more minor contributors rather than just providing the transcribed names.

Alternatively, access points or identifiers could be justified with notes on responsibility. This would give the cataloger more flexibility in recording the information. It would reduce the burden of transcribing from title frames for moving images, as names and roles could be taken from the container or external sources instead. It also supports more readable displays in current MARC- and ISBD-based catalogs by enabling long lists of names and roles to be split up and organized. For some materials, such as feature films, it may be more beneficial to users to display roles in a standard order rather than in the order that they appear on the resource. This is what IMDb does, although they do order the names within a given role, such as when listing the cast.

Transcribed SORs do provide some benefits over using notes or access points with relationship designators. Transcribed SORs record usage for establishing preferred forms of names. Transcribed names help users to interpret records when the form of the name on the piece varies from the authorized form. However, there are other ways besides the type of transcription used in SORs to record usage, as IMDb shows (for example, "Laurence Fishburne (as Larry Fishburne)").

4. Allow cataloger's judgment for dividing information between the SOR and notes

Rather than have a principled solution, it may be better to take a practical approach and identify a solution where catalogers are able to choose whether to transcribe certain information in an SOR or put it in a note, such as 508 or 511. Only a single SOR is core so any of the other ones could be recorded in notes. This would allow us to continue doing something that is workable in our current environment while leaving the door open for changes in the future. Decisions about which type of roles to put where could be made by individual catalogers or institutions, by communities of practice, or through guidelines, such as LCPCC-PS.

In order to avoid linking these notes exclusively to either expression or work roles, the instructions for these notes should appear in chapter 2 (identifying manifestations and items) rather than chapter 7 (describing content), which is split between work and expression attributes. The SOR, as distinct from the Authorized Access Point (AAP), is considered an attribute of the manifestation because it is transcribed from the resource in hand. It is more difficult to come up with a rationale for considering non-transcribed notes about roles and responsibilities to be an attribute of the manifestation. The

information included in Performer and Credit notes is usually based on information on the manifestation (although perhaps from the container rather than the title frames (for a moving image) or the disc label (for a sound recording)) and includes names as they appear on the resource. The information in the note may be reformatted and re-ordered from what is on the resource, and the wording of the person's role may be modified. On the other hand, information in these notes could also be taken from other sources. The existence of notes related to SORs (2.20.3) suggests that RDA does support non-transcribed, contextual recording of the kinds of information that could also appear in a transcribed SOR.

We have identified two potential places to incorporate this kind of instruction into RDA.

Option A. 2.20.3 (notes on statement of responsibility)

One possibility would be to use 2.20.3 (notes on statement of responsibility). Currently the scope of 2.20.3 is limited to:

1. Attribution. This is used when responsibility has been attributed to an entity not named in the statement of responsibility. This could potentially be used for our purposes. However, the examples suggest that there is a degree of uncertainty or outright incorrectness about the attribution, which is not true of our proposed use.
2. Variant forms of names.
3. Changes in statement of responsibility.
4. Other information related to a statement of responsibility. It seems that our desired Performer and Credit notes could fall in this category. Maybe all that needs to be done is to delete 7.23 and 7.24 and the references to them and add 508 and 511 to the MARC mapping for 2.20.3 and rely on practice for implementation. However, it might be beneficial to provide some explicit direction in the text of RDA, perhaps as an option, or at least some relevant examples.

Option B. 2.4.1.6 (more than one statement of responsibility)

Alternatively, a more prominent place to address Performer and Credit information might be 2.4.1.6 (more than one statement of responsibility). Could 2.4.1.6 be tweaked so that some statements could be mapped to MARC 508 and 511 fields? Although 2.4.1.6 begins with the instruction to "record," the general instructions on recording SORs related to the title proper (2.4.2.3) refer back to 2.4.1.4, which says to transcribe. (We understand from the editor's guide that "transcribe" is used as the principal verb only in instructions that specifically prescribe transcription of an element as it appears on the source of information, and that "record" is used as the principal verb in subsequent instructions, even if they refer back to an earlier, more basic instruction to transcribe.) Does this linkage to 2.4.1.4 imply that by mapping some SORs from 2.4.1.6 to 508 and 511 instead of 245 \$c, those MARC fields would have to become transcribed elements under RDA? For the practical reasons described above, we would not want to lose the freedom to

record performer and artistic/technical credit information in whatever way makes the most sense and would not want to be forced to strictly transcribe it in every instance. Could the instruction at 2.4.1.6 be modified to say “transcribe or record,” or “record but do not necessarily transcribe?” How do we reconcile the practice of splitting up information among SORs (245\$c), Performer (511 notes), and Credit (508) notes with the instruction to record SORs in the sequence found on the piece?

2.4.2.3 Recording Statements of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper

Record statements of responsibility relating to title proper by applying the basic instructions at [2.4.1](#).

2.4.1.4 Recording Statements of Responsibility

Transcribe a statement of responsibility as it appears on the source of information (see [1.7](#)).

As with 2.20.3, the addition of some relevant examples would be beneficial if we were to pursue having 2.4.1.6 cover these types of statements.